

Date: 2011-05-05  
Author: Bruce Fetzer  
Category: Oral History  
Interview Date: May 5, 2011 10:00 - noon EDT  
Place: Fetzer Institute  
Interviewee: Bruce Fetzer  
Interviewer: Larry Massie  
Attendees: Larry and Priscilla Massie, Tom Beaver  
Topic: John Fetzer's Spiritual Search  
Draft: June 7, 2011  
Edited: December 9, 2017

Bruce Do you want to set the context, Larry?

Larry Sure. I guess one of the things that I'd like to know is: If for some miraculous reason you could talk to John right today, what would you ask him about his spiritual journey that you don't know?

Bruce Where is he and what does that have to do with the Institute's purpose now? Because John was continually studying. He was learning. He was growing. I think his core legacy for the Institute was to individually and collectively awaken to spirit and discern spirit's guidance and direction in a contemporary sense. I don't think he was trying to create a point in time to say, This is the way it's always going to be, or, This is a set of beliefs.

But John defined a lot of his emphasis and priorities from his intuition, and so he felt that there was a message that was being conferred upon the Institute, emanating from the White Brotherhood and Archangel Michael. The question would then be, for me, What is that message now? Given that we're just upon the precipice of one of the key dates that he set forth. He said December 24, 2011, would be a date of extreme economic upheaval, and he also gave clear direction to both Lou and myself to watch out for economic upset and to make sure the portfolio is guarded. Would he have any insight into that? And perhaps was the wake-up call in 2008, 2009 sufficient for the global markets to start cooperating?

So that's what I would say as an answer to that. One of the things I wanted to cover today, and this isn't a question that either Tom or you had been talking about: I went through my records and actually brought a whole collection of books in that John read and then gave to me to read. I have a whole case of these right now. I've got about 30 books; what's important about these books is that these are books that John annotated. I can see specifically the things that mattered to him. Then I can also use that as a reference point to explain some of these other questions that are coming up. How did John reconcile his traditional upbringing with his New Age thought process? I think that's a very key question that

illustrates not just John's growth, but also how he integrated and included the past into the future. He didn't discount anything, but what he did was he built upon.

One book I'd want to go into just a little bit here, not that we'd spend extensive time on it, but I wanted to just go into two different passages out of the Aquarian Gospel of Jesus the Christ. This is by Levi, who said that he transcribed this from the Akashic records in 1908. It actually became a cornerstone of the New Age movement in the 70's. This covers a lot of bases, because not only was it a divine book like A Course in Miracles, but it was one of the books, in addition to A Course in Miracles, that the Monday night group studied. It was also a book that was brought to John's attention through Jim; so you had all the main players here come to bear in this. This had to be in the early 80's obviously, it's when we brought this into the Monday night group.

What I wanted to do is say two different passages out of this book that reconcile the traditional Christian scripture to the writings of the Aquarian Gospel. What this will do is highlight the fact that John at this point had transcended to a more mystical experience-based type of Christianity. That thought process is that we've been here before, that there are multiple chances to reincarnate and pay debts to the past, and that our purpose now is to awaken to soul and to become Christ-like. In that, it's each and every one of our abilities to go inside and find that.

When John read a book, he would take the front of the book and he would make annotations of key passages, in addition to reading and underlining some of the scriptures in the text itself. In the front of this book, which was John's book, he's got about a dozen key areas where he's highlighted elements. These are all elements that talk about the word of God, the mystical power of God, the awakened state, soul awareness, the resurrection.

I wanted to go into two very, very key elements in Christianity. One is, What is salvation? The other one is, How do you actually confer this? There are two very well-known stories in the Bible, which are taught in Christianity. I wanted to read both the NIV version of the scripture, and then also the direct recitation from the Aquarian Gospel.

The first one goes to the core of the Christian message which is very well known in the Bible, at John 3:16, How do you get saved? So here's what the scripture says: In John 3:16, the NIV version: "For God so loved the world that he gave His one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life. For God didn't send his Son into the world to condemn the world but to save the world through him. Whoever believes in him is not condemned, but whoever does not believe stands condemned already, because they have not believed in the name of God's one and only Son."

What happens in the Aquarian Gospel is that this is extended quite a bit; Jesus is talking to a blind man. This is the Aquarian Gospel chapter 139, starting with

verse five: “The blind man asked Jesus, the man inquired then, ‘Why do you say the Son of God? Is there only one Son of God?’ And Jesus said, ‘All men are sons of God by birth. God is the father of the race, but all are not the sons of God by faith. He who attains the victory over self is son of God by faith. And he who speaks to you has overcome, and he is called the son of God because he is the pattern for the sons of men.’” What Jesus then goes on to tell is the parable of the wheat and the chaff, explaining that to the apostles. In that famous parable, the masses were confused and bewildered because they didn’t see the message in it, other than that there is a practical level of allowing the chaff and the wheat to grow, together and then separate them at the harvest. What Jesus is saying is that he is actually the shepherd and the keeper, and that the wheat is the awakened state. He goes on to explain that, and then the apostles can see and hear.

There’s another verse here that’s basically the distinction between where John was in his search, and where traditional thinking would hold him. What I mean by that is, John was about individually awakening and becoming that Light and that Word. Here’s another example where Jesus conferred to the apostles the power to heal. This is in the traditional NIV version, in chapter Luke verse one: “When Jesus called the twelve together, he gave them power and authority to drive out all demons and to cure diseases, and he sent them out to proclaim the kingdom of God and heal the sick.” That’s basically what the Bible says about that. Here’s what is repeated in the Aquarian Gospel chapter 89, starting with verse two: “And Jesus said, ‘This is the day to consecrate yourselves into the work of God, so let us pray. Turn from the outer to the inner self. Close all the doors of carnal self and wait. The holy breath will fill this place and you will be baptized in the holy breath.’ And then they prayed.” John has outlined all of this. He’s underlined all of this stuff, so this is important to him. “And then they prayed. A light more brilliant than the noonday sun filled all the room, and the tongues of the flame from every head rose high in the air. The atmosphere of Galilee was set astir. A sound like distant thunder rolled above Capernaum and men heard songs as though 10,000 angels joined in full accord. Then the 12 disciples heard a voice, a still small voice, and just one word was said, a word they dared not speak. It was the sacred name of God. And Jesus said to them, ‘By this omnific word you may control the elements, all the powers of the air. And within your souls you speak this word. You have the keys of life and death, of things that are, of things that were, of things that are to be. Behold, you are the 12 great branches of the Christine vine, the 12 foundation stones, 12 apostles of the Christ. As lambs you were set forth among wild beasts, but the omnific word will be your buckler and your shield.’ ‘And then again the air was filled with song and every living creature seemed to say praise God.’”

So that’s a major distinction here - that the role of faith versus being and transformation is significantly different, far more experiential, and far more personal and individualistic. I think this is a key distinction. What we’re doing is capturing here the nexus between John’s preparation and his upbringing; we’re

seeing where he was in the 80's, and how that impacted the philosophy of the founding vision.

Here's another example: Right here, where Jesus actually practiced this, and this also is a very famous story, where Jesus cast out a demon. Now this is out of the NIV Bible, in Luke chapter four verse 31; Jesus basically went to Capernaum and was teaching. I'll just read it; it's not that long: "Then Jesus went to Capernaum, a town of Galilee, and on the Sabbath he taught the people. They were amazed at his teaching because his words had authority. In the synagogue there was a man possessed by a demon, an impure spirit. He cried at the top of his voice, 'Go away. What do you want with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the holy one of God.' 'Be quiet,' Jesus said sternly. 'Come out of him.' Then the demon threw the man down before them all and came out without injuring him. All the people were amazed and said to each other, 'What words these are. With authority and power he gives orders to impure spirits, and they come out.' And the news about him spread throughout the surrounding area." In this account you see Jesus doing something to somebody else.

Now, here's the Aquarian Gospel of Jesus the Christ on the same event. This is chapter 89, verse 13: "The next day was Sabbath day and Jesus went with his disciples to the synagogue, and there he taught. The people said, 'He teaches not as of the scribes and Pharisees, but as a man who knows and has authority to speak.' As Jesus spoke, a man obsessed came in. Evil spirits that obsessed the man were of the baser sort. They often threw their victim to the ground or in the fire. When the spirit saw the Christine master in the synagogue, they knew him and they said, 'You are the Son of God. Why are you here? Would you destroy us by the Word before our time? We would have not to do with you—let us alone.' But Jesus said to them, 'By the omnific Word I speak, Come out. Torment this man no more. Go to your place.' Then the unclean spirits threw the man to the floor and with a fiendish cry they went away. And Jesus lifted up the man." This is important, verse 20. "And Jesus lifted up the man and said to him, 'If you will keep your mind fully occupied with good, the evil spirits cannot find a place to stay. They only come to empty heads and hearts. Go on your way and sin no more.' The people were astonished at the words that Jesus spoke, and the work he did and they asked among themselves." Now this is everything I think, say, and do. So the role of responsibility and individual practice, it is center stage in the mystical experience. I think that's important as a distinction. We could go on and on, because John outlined a lot of this book, but I think that is the basis for John's philosophical approach.

Larry Can I say something?

Bruce Sure.

Larry I know that John was well-grounded in the Bible. And, by the way, I'd like to know what version he had, whether it was the King James or the one you're using, we could probably find that out. But most people who accept Christianity are very satisfied to feel that faith is it. If they have faith, then they're going to heaven. I think John went way beyond that. The faith did not satisfy him. He had to find out more, and that's why he got into the New Age and all these other explorations. Even though there is an element of being grounded in the Bible, he just went beyond it. Do you agree?

Bruce Absolutely. And Tom, you can chime in at this point too, because you and John have had many talks about this. And other interviews will support this; John was about creating groups to hone the light, by gathering together, so it's not just a profession or recitation of a creed or a statement. There is an actual physical responsibility and spiritual responsibility that goes beyond the outer action. There's an inner process to the founding vision of the Institute.

Tom Can I chime in here a little bit? First of all, Jim Keating and Carolyn Dailey both said that Aquarian Gospel was studied by that original Sunday group as well, Bruce, in the mid to later 70's.

Bruce Okay.

Tom It had preceded even the Monday night group, just as a timeline thing. But I agree with your response to Larry, and I would even go beyond that, in my time with John anyway. When he was in MSIA, the notion was that faith, an orthodox Christian type of faith which, in the Protestant tradition, would hopefully get you into heaven after you died - that's certainly not part of the MSIA tradition. I don't think John held to that when I was living with him.

In the MSIA tradition, which is a take-off of the Indian Surat Shabd tradition, there are spiritual levels on the other side; and the meditation practice gets you into one level, then the next, then the next; without that meditation practice you're really not getting anywhere spiritually; so, in that sense, faith gets you nowhere. Faith would get you into some astral plane between lives, and then you'd come back. There's no ultimate heaven. Maybe the point is, as soon as you believe in reincarnation, this ultimate heaven notion of orthodox Christianity, and perhaps orthodox Islam and perhaps orthodox Judaism as well, falls by the wayside. Without that notion of an ultimate heaven that faith would get you into, then faith really loses its pre-eminence.

Bruce Right.

Larry Tom, is it true that ultimately John [Fetzer] rejected MSIA?

Tom No, no absolutely not. He was doing the MSIA meditation as he was withdrawing from his body in the death process. No, that was it. He may have had personal

issues about John-Roger as a person, because he was afraid that John-Roger wanted money from him.

Larry Well, Jim Gordon was not practicing MSIA, was he?

Tom Yes, he was practicing it. He wasn't teaching it. He hadn't made himself into a spiritual teacher, which he started doing in around 2000 to 2002. He went into a transition period then ten years after John died.

Larry Oh, okay.

Tom He was merely a disciple of John-Roger himself, which he became in the 1983, '84 period; and then within a year John also was initiated into it. The reason I moved into the house was really to help John with that practice, and support him more.

Larry Now Bruce, can I ask you something?

Tom That never deviated.

Bruce Let me follow up, because I wanted to add to what Tom said; this is a good way of contrasting faith systems. In the Christian sense, depending on what faith you're talking about, it's pretty well defined, based on scripture, what's necessary for salvation. Most would say baptism. Most would say confession. Most would say, believe, repent, and believe in Jesus. Some would go beyond and say, and then act. If you contrast that with what John highlighted in the front of the Aquarian Gospel as the most important scriptures for reference, he talks about initiation. Jesus initiated his apostles.

Then he's got another one, a footnote here, steps to soul awareness; he's got those articulated, and then he's got references to soul annotated. He's got references to the Holy Breath and to the Word. The Holy Breath as a comforter, which is really the Holy Spirit. Then crucifixion, Joseph of Arimathea, and then Jesus' travels to India, Rome and so forth. Those are just some things that I would point out in John's own words that support the approach that we're trying to document here. That is that there's a mystical practice that goes beyond a belief system.

Tom And by the way, to chime in some more, it's fascinating that John started studying this with what we've referred to as A Course in Miracles group, with that particular group of people in the mid to late 70's, mid to later 70's, and then again with the Monday night group.

It's probably not likely that John was initiated when he was going through this, studying this with the Monday night group and making these underlines and stuff, because he didn't get initiated until '84, '85. In which case, these notions of the Word, of the Holy Breath, those tend to make New Age seekers scratch their head

and perhaps start looking for something at a higher level. What is this Word? What is this Holy Breath? In the Rosicrucian tradition, by the way, the whole thing is about The Lost Word. People can start saying, What is this Lost Word? In the Surat Shabd Yoga tradition, when it shows up, what comes in to a person's meditation is an energy, a sound, a power, an energy. It's almost like a rocket ship, a word and a rushing of breath almost. This energy comes in in the meditation if it's successful, and lifts the person out of their body.

Larry By uttering that word?

Tom No, it comes in internally. There is a mantra generally that's repeated in the meditation; it's maybe some coarse approximation of what this sound may actually be, but when it comes in, it comes in inside your head. It's nothing from the outside. It comes in as a roar, and that roar just pops you right up, out and up, straight up. For John, what this indicates is that he is making these underlines of the Word, of the Holy Breath; perhaps when the sound current tradition was introduced to him by Jim Gordon, he was probably somewhat ready for it.

This would have filled in what possibly, in a practical sense, this word was, this sound was, this breath - What is this stuff? The Surat Shabd tradition answers that question. It's very fascinating to me, Bruce, that he would have highlighted these things in the Aquarian Gospel: the Word, the Breath. Highlighting those notions would indicate to me that he was preparing himself for the explanation that MSIA provided for what those were; it's more than just an explanation, because when you sit down and do the meditation, it works. This sound, this power does come in and does take you out, so it actually works.

Bruce Just a correction for the timeline, Tom. My intel is that John was initiated on May 11, 1986. I know that because I went back to my records. I remember Michael Fader gave me a stock tip that didn't pan out on May 12, and I went back to prior tax returns and was able to verify a purchase on a trade I made. That was a spring trip that J-R and Michael Fader took. When J-R initiated John, he gave him all the initiations at the same time, all the way to soul. In the MSIA tradition you're supposed to be initiated into the astral by hearing his name, but then you meditate for two years, and apply for the causal, the mental, the etheric, and then soul initiation. But J-R gave John all of them at once.

Tom So that '86 date's even better. That makes it impossible for that annotating to have been done while John was initiated. His initiation came afterwards. By the end of June of '86 I was in the house.

Bruce Yes, the Monday night group was done by the fall of '85.

Tom Yes.

Larry Bruce, you embraced MSIA also, didn't you?

Bruce Yes.

Larry Did you become a minister?

Bruce Yes, I was a minister, and I was initiated at causal level.

Larry Is it true that John was not happy about that?

Bruce No, he was delighted that I became a minister. But he was unhappy that Chuck Spence later asked me to perform his marriage to Joy. This was after Chuck was separated from the Institute; I asked John's permission, and he said absolutely not. I told Chuck I couldn't do it, and then I just allowed my my ministerial license to expire. I didn't want the position being subjected to any pressure.

Larry Why did you think John didn't want you to do that?

Bruce He thought that Chuck was just trying to get back in good with the Institute is all.

Larry Using you.

Bruce Right.

Larry That's interesting.

Tom Joy, the woman he was marrying, was probably an initiate by then. In actuality, Bruce, that may have been the reason they asked you; it may not have been manipulative, but John would have been worried about.

Bruce Right. That's just the story behind that.

Larry Did you want to continue on this vein?

PM Were there any stories that were in the previous interviews that you felt that you hadn't finished? You mentioned that.

Bruce Yes, I'd have to read that. What I probably will do when I read that transcript is instead of read it into the oral record, I'll probably just annotate it, if that works.

PM That works great. That's fine.

Larry Sure.

Tom Bruce, one of my questions pertained to one of those. When I read it, I saw that you had shared that John would ask Jim about your past lives; and then you

started with a for instance, "John shared with me..." Did John share with you your past lives as they were told to him by Jim Gordon?

Bruce In one instance he did. John felt that he was Ramses II and I was a priest in one of the temples in Egypt. My brother Paul was also a priest. We were specifically cited as part of a ceremony, and John shared about that. I don't remember all the details about it. But John was intensely interested in not just knowing about his past lives, but the past lives of people around him. The reason that was important to him was that he used that as a confirmation that the group came back together for a reason; and in some respects it was used as a filter. For instance, he had found out about Jerry Luptak, when he was Louis XIV. He (Luptak) was the treasurer, and raided the treasury to build Versailles. John was wary after that, and it turned out that Jerry did it again.

Larry If the same group of people kept coming back for some goal, and John felt that this was the last time that he was coming back, does that mean that the rest of the people are no longer coming back too?

Bruce No, it doesn't mean that. All he wanted to do was make sure that he left it in the hands of people he could trust. I think that's what his motivation was, to make sure that people were open enough, and had the innate motivation to carry on this mission. Because he was afraid of two things really: One was that the original purpose would be lost, the spiritual purpose of it; and secondly, that there would be some type of a financial inability to perform the mission. I think it was his way of conferring the urgency that he felt onto other people. I think that's what it was, and it certainly worked for me. I felt it.

Larry Earlier you mentioned that he had predicted a date - Did you say December 24, 2011? when there's going to be problems. Where was that prediction?

Bruce That was back in the 80's. In the 80's he made three predictions. He said that healthcare costs would evolve into a crisis scenario in the United States, and that has come to pass. There's no question about it. He said that there would be an energy crisis, that trends were unsustainable, and, depending on who you read, that is a likely scenario, barring some new technology discovery. The third was going to be a global economic collapse, and it was going to be based upon the fact that something would change confidence; when you change confidence in a system based on credit, then the whole system fails. That's basically a paraphrase of what his exact recitation was.

What's interesting is 2008 was exactly such an event. You had an enormous amount of leverage, and the change in confidence caused a self-fulfilling prophecy; and now we're back on the flip side of that. Markets go from fear to greed, and the cycles tend to be more pronounced. The questions in my mind would be, whether the capital reserve ratios are sufficient now to handle the next

one, and whether the central banks have coordinated enough to be able to recognize the next major calamity and to step in in a concerted way.

Larry Of course, they helped cause the last one.

Bruce The misuse of leverage actually caused it. There were a number of causes, but that's kind of outside the scope of this. There were failed administrative policies, the misuse of leverage, a financial system that rewarded greed. If I'm an MBA on Wall Street, I can take all the risk in the world; if I win, I get multi-million dollar bonuses; if I lose, the taxpayer bails me out.

The same thing is happening now with banks, with the yield curve. The fact that the Fed is lending the banks that are borrowing treasuries and lending back to them. It's just a shell game in many respects.

Larry Sure.

Tom The banks don't have to loan. Bruce, if I can chime in here, as to that particular date (December 24, 2011): I have found twice in my research, in the interviews that Jim did with Kaye Collins, that Jim specifically refers to December 24, 2011, not 2012, but 2011, as a time when basically the West Coast will fall in the ocean. I think that's where it is, not in the channelings that Jim did, but in the interviews with Kaye. Jim has told me this several times. It's in the interviews with Kaye, which were done in what, '80, '81 in that time period, '82 maybe.

PM Is this Jim Gordon you're talking about?

Tom Yes, Jim Gordon. He saw this in a vision; Jim also presumes that he will be in San Francisco when this happens, because that's how he saw it. He also saw 9/11 in a vision and he was in New York in the experience; but he didn't end up being in 9/11. But twice in the interviews, Bruce, he specifically refers to and confirms this December 24, 2011 date as when "the big one" would hit the West Coast. So it must be even more than "the big one," because even the big one that hit Japan didn't make it fall in the ocean. Something truly cataclysmic on December 24, 2011 [was to happen]. Did John ever talk to you about that date regarding this cataclysmic thing?

Bruce Not in regard to a cataclysm. He thought there would be a global economic collapse. But here's the other point to make: Jim forecast a number of other economic tribulations that never came to pass, and even though John talked to me about those, he didn't hold onto them. The three things I just recited were the ones that he really held onto, so John had his own filters.

Larry I see Seventh Day Adventism coming in here.

Bruce Right.

Larry You know about that?

Bruce We actually had a symposium with John Peterson from Arlington on 2012; he's a strategic planner for the Air Force, but he's a very integrated, open person, works with psychics and so forth. He found about a dozen different faith systems that actually point to dates around then.

Larry Around that day?

Bruce Yes, the end of the Mayan calendar. There are about a dozen things.

Larry Oh, yes. The Seventh Day Adventist Church flowed from the Millerite movement. William Miller predicted the exact end of the world, and the Seventh Day Adventist faith believe that time is short. Something's going to happen any day now. I'm wondering if that might have been residual?

PM From his early childhood.

Tom Even the New Age tradition has this apocalyptic notion. I think all the western traditions have an apocalyptic notion.

Bruce Same with Christianity.

Larry The Resurrection.

Bruce Yes, if you look at it. One of the most popular book series and movie series is called Left Behind. There are tens of millions of - it's just everywhere in the literature and the culture right now.

Larry More of the fundamental Christianity, I think.

Tom The Mayan calendar thing, Larry, that's December 24, 2012.

Larry Oh, is it?

Tom I used to wonder whether Jim was just confused by a year; he insisted on 2011, but December 24, 2012 is the specific date of the end of the Mayan calendar. The history channel is just full of those shows; those shows are everywhere about that date given by the Mayans.

Larry Tom, where are you planning to be on Christmas Eve?

Tom Not here on the West Coast. Where will I be the year before on that date—because I've gone over that in my head a hundred times? I might take a chance. But I would guess the West Coast will be pretty deserted on December 24, 2012,

though. I imagine there will be a lot of people in Vegas on that date, though I think Vegas is supposed to sink, too. It's supposed to be so big. I think they're saying, Where's the coastline supposed to be?

Larry Couldn't you just get east of the San Andreas Fault and feel pretty good?

Bruce When something like that happens, there's nowhere to hide. Everything will change everywhere.

Larry But if that happened that could bring the economic crash too.

Bruce Everything will change.

PM Oh yes, California is the third largest economy.

Tom Yes, it's the eighth largest economy in the world.

Bruce Yes, right, that's the same thing as the eighth biggest country in the world being gone. That's neither here nor there. In the parlance of investments, you can't hedge that event, because anyone who's on the other side of that trade can't make good on it. There is no way to prepare for something like that. So let's move on.

Larry Okay. Did you know Rhea's brother, Vant?

Bruce No.

Larry You never knew him? He would be your great uncle, too, wouldn't he?

Bruce Yes, I guess he would, wouldn't he, yes.

Larry You knew that he was into experimenting with brain waves, alpha and beta?

Bruce Absolutely he was.

Larry Did you know John funded some of that?

Bruce Yes, absolutely he did.

Larry In the 1960's.

Bruce Absolutely he did. Vant Yeager also surfaced one of the first projects of the Institute.

Larry Oh, really?

Bruce Absolutely. Vant Yeager brought a young researcher by the name of Dr. James Hardt to John's attention. In the 80's, the first science project we funded was Dr. Elmer Green, and this is a matter of record. It's in the minutes. Jim Hardt had been funded for quite a while, maybe even before I came, because Bob Jahn was funded, Herb Benson was funded, and I think John had been funding Jim Hardt as well.

Tom That's right, Bruce, I think that was one of the big six or eight projects of that era.

Bruce Yes, so Jim Hardt's work was looking at EEGs, at brain mapping through electroencephalograph. He was doing research on hooking up two people meditating side by side, and he was able to show entanglement.

Larry Linking of their brain waves.

Bruce Linking of the two different patterns when these two people were in meditation. It was very intriguing, because he was using it as a creativity development tool for business, and he got funded by one of the heirs to Proctor and Gamble; he set up a pilot site out there. Then his technology got adopted, and was being used by Canyon Ranch, which is an upscale spa in Tucson. Canyon Ranch charged high dollars, and it was very high net worth people that would go there and spend a lot of money. He had a clinic there as well, where he trained people in relaxation and EEG feedback. That was Dr. Jim Hardt.

But John also funded a lot of folks. He was first hand. He would check a lot of things out. Some of the people may not even be recorded in the minutes, like Ken Pelletier got some of his first funding, and he's really one of the world experts now on health promotion. We're flipping the tape.

Well, I'll just complete that thought, because Judy Skutch, in her second interview, talked about all the people that she introduced John to and that John had talked to. Most of those people are still alive, and we could go back to that interview and create a list of people to check up on. But it's worth it, at least as an ancillary to this, to document the work that they were doing, to provide external confirmation of John's interest. That's a fairly big project we can do at any point in time. It ought to be done in—

PM While they're still here.

Larry Sometimes he did very thorough research on whether he was going to fund something or not. Do you know the story between Jeanne Dixon and him?

Bruce No, I don't.

Larry From what I can put together, they were very close at one time in the 1960's. She would come at times when he was winning awards, and she would be there and

they'd have their picture taken. But she tried to get money from John for some sort of a children's hospital and he checked into it and found that it was not feasible, and I think that was the end of their relationship.

Bruce Wouldn't surprise me.

Larry That happened with other people, too.

PM How about Jim Keating's proposal? What is your knowledge on that? Were you aware of that?

Bruce Yes, I saw in Tom's notes that Jim Keating wrote a proposal for John. If the dates were in the 60's or 70's, I would have no knowledge of that; but if it was in the 80's, I don't think Jim was with Nazareth at that time.

PM It was mid 70's.

Bruce So I don't have any knowledge of that. What I can say is that in 1981, when I came into town, John was under review by the IRS, who wanted to revoke the exempt status of the Institute. John hired Jerry Luptak, who was a very skilled tax attorney, to represent him; John ended up prevailing in the case. But the basis of the case, and this is also in the files of the Institute, was that John controlled it. It was the Foundation at the time and the Foundation was a public entity. It was a support organization, 509(a)3. Jerry and John prevailed in that case. Part of the solution came out of trying to find partners to work in conjunction with, to confirm the validity of its non-profit status.

Nazareth [College] was being courted at the time, as well as Borgess, as well as a number of other entities. That's how Sister Liz got into the Monday night group. She was a representative of Nazareth. But I'm not familiar with the proposal from Jim Keating.

Larry It was a very modest proposal, \$25,000 I think; but one of the problems was, they brought in a guy to run Nazareth who was from Western [Michigan University], the business college, and he didn't want any part of that.

Tom I think the way Jim presented it to us was that this was potentially, a big deal. But what was happening at that point was that John was making contact with different universities, several universities, putting out feelers; Nazareth may have been one of them, but probably wasn't the only one.

Bruce As a backdrop, John was just licking his wounds from the Rainsford fiasco at K-College. I don't know if you know that story.

Larry I don't.

Bruce Kalamazoo College. This was in the 70's, and would have been a matter of record, so this could all be reconstructed in an accurate fashion. John gave preferred stock, non-voting, non-dividend preferred stock in Fetzer Television to Kalamazoo College. The president of Kalamazoo College was Rainsford at the time, and he wanted to convert that to cash. That is kind of idiotic, to take a very wealthy individual who is on your Board and force him to convert a donation into cash. There's a huge correspondence file between the president of K-College and John, ending up in the president's termination.

Larry Oh, really?

Bruce Yes, the president lost his job over that, and other things like that. The end result was the creation of some kind of a lecture series there; that was when Ed Mitchell was brought in, and some others. Then what happened was, as the relationship deteriorated, the money wasn't used for a lecture series anymore. I don't know what the name of that lecture series was, Tom. That's a matter of record, too, but it was probably something like Frontiers and—

Tom Yes, I think that's it.

Bruce Frontiers, something like that. It was non-conventional people like Mitchell talking about futuristic things, bordering on the New Age, with K-College having veto power on the speaker. Then it finally disintegrated in the early 80's, when I came into town. I started working for the Institute. I had to meet with Win Chou Chen as a representative of Kalamazoo College. He'd been there forever, and he and I worked out a deal in which the balance of the funds would be used to buy AV equipment, and there would be a plaque put on the wall for the Rhea Y. Fetzer AV Center.

John had already had his fill of private colleges. He probably didn't want to repeat the same. Around that time, he did fund Dr. Dick Williams at Borgess, who set up the first holistic health center there. He was a psychologist. They had a doctor, a priest, and I think a nurse, and they were pretty much disowned by the hospital. So John pretty much developed a bad taste for trying to do work at other locations.

Tom According to Jim Keating, John approved the proposal but then Nazareth rejected it. That's how Jim Keating put it.

Bruce Wouldn't be surprising to me.

Tom Yes.

Larry I think Williams was at Western when he got that funding.

Bruce Williams was at Western in the 80's.

Larry Oh, after that.

Bruce Yes, that was after. I don't know when the Holistic Health Institute at Borgess was. It was before my time.

Larry 70's I believe.

Bruce Yes, it would be the 70's. Williams might have been at Western then. I don't know. So that was the question about Keating, and I don't have knowledge of the 70's.

Tom Bruce, is it okay if I ask the next one on my list?

Bruce Yeas, go ahead.

Tom I've been going through, still reading, transcribing, and re-transcribing onto my computer a lot of Jim Gordon's channelings in '81, '82, '83. At that time he channeled to John, either through tape which got transcribed, or sometimes in letter form, he would write John a letter. Some of those tapings you were present at as well, Bruce. I think particularly in '83.

Bruce Yes.

Tom The channelings were by the different masters of the Great White Brotherhood, Jesus, Archangel Michael, St. Germain, Kuthumi, Paul the Venetian, plus Kato who's kind of a different character, but also one of the masters although he's not in the theosophical tradition for the Great White Brotherhood. But these channelings were directing John fairly specifically to have the Foundation do a mind, body, spirit mission, and to work on improving physical health; also as part of that, to put in a lab to invent devices on energy healing.

My question to you, Bruce, is how influential do you think those channeling messages were on John? Did John accept the channelings that came through Jim, or did he have, as you would say, other filters?

Bruce I think they were extremely influential on John in several ways. This is a whole tape, because you would actually have to go through, channeling by channeling, and develop references to how they were applied. Some of them were literally applied.

What I found, and here's my explanation of the channelings, is that it was probably the clearest statement from John on what he felt the purpose at the time was. Because John would get into meetings like this, and wouldn't be exactly sure; then he would go to Jim who, I think, was in some respects reading John. Right here in words now were clear articulations of the things that John talked

about, but not in a concise way. I felt that the channelings partly came from John's higher self, and then also literally came from some source beyond both Jim and John; that part of him frankly could have been influenced by Jim as well.

Because the messenger also has an interpretation, you can't say that Jim was a pure channel or anybody is a pure channel. But it certainly came close to it. When I was in those sessions, it was a sense of just pure spirit. There was not feeling of manipulation there. What I would say is, there's an important theme throughout the whole channelings, which is part of the enduring founding purpose. In the specifics, that probably would not apply anymore.

What I'm saying is, if you think of it in terms of the Bible: in the Old Testament, there are a lot of rules and laws, and those go for a point in time, but if you're a contemporary Christian, for example, you would rely on things that supercede the law. That's how I think of the channelings in that regard, because the things that are enduring truths are: the individual role in awakening, the collective admonition to create a group process, and the requirement to continually define and hold in the light the divine, the future direction.

The way I like to think about it is: if John were here, he wouldn't be stuck in scripture, as laid down in the channelings of 1981. What he would do is say, "Okay, what's next?" Because things move and change, and just like in his businesses, he adapted, moved, and changed.

Larry Bruce, were you ever present at a channeling in which one of these eight personalities that John felt that he had been was first revealed to him?

Bruce I was at most of these channelings. There were a lot of tapes. Jim had a lot of channelings with John, a lot of sessions, and many of those tapes were not transcribed. As I understand, in a lot of *those* was when Jim was doing light readings and that kind of thing.

Larry But do you see what I'm getting at though?

Bruce Yes.

Larry I'm wondering two things. I'm wondering, did the idea come from John, and he asked Jim about it, or was John surprised by this information?

Bruce John was inspired. John was truly inspired. He was really in an open place of receiving, of gratitude, of love. You think about the preparation of the heart. John was open and prepared; there's something that happened in those sessions. I don't know how to relate this for future generations, but think of a time when you were in a religious or spiritual service and you had some type of awakening or something transformational happened.

Larry An epiphany?

Bruce Yes. If you're not religious, think about your wedding, your wedding day and how everything is different, because you're present, you're open, you're loving, you're accepting, you're enthusiastic. There's something that happened in those sessions that was different than the conversation we're having now.

Larry Would it be like joy?

Bruce It would. There were times when I would just be lifted up, and out. I wouldn't even be in my body, and it's not like I was an individual. There was an event that was happening, there was an experience; so there was something that happened beyond the information, and most of the time we didn't have the information until we read the transcript afterwards. That's an important point. I need to repeat this, because to answer your question, What did John think about someone coming through and saying I'm so and so? He probably wouldn't think anything of it until afterwards, when he read it and found out what it was about.

Larry Oh, this was not articulated? The channelings were not articulated?

Bruce Oh, they were. There are transcriptions. But what I'm saying is, do you remember all of your wedding ceremony? You were in the experience of it and experiencing that. When I see a video of my wedding, for instance, it's a different experience from the day that I was actually participating in it. That's the contrast that I'd like to use to answer this question. There was something happening in those sessions that went way beyond a transfer of information.

Larry Would John be asking Jim things?

Bruce Yes, it would be conversational. The way the channelings would work is, we'd sit down. Jim would call in The Light. There would be a short meditation. There'd be silence with a meditation; then it used to take ten, 15 minutes, but then later it would just take half a minute or so, and Jim would just start talking. Sometimes in the channelings, Jim, as the voice, would say, "Do you have questions?" John rarely had questions. I was the one that asked most of the questions. John rarely asked questions.

Larry Would Jim announce in a different voice sometimes that he was a different—

Bruce No.

Larry It would always be his same voice? He would say who he was?

Bruce Here's an example of one channeling. I'll just open this up. I have a whole book of these: This is a letter: Dear John, an ancient call rides the winds this day, calling man's soul homeward. This is signed Michael, overseer of the inner call.

So this basically talks about the progression, this is in 1983. This is three years before John was initiated now. To answer your question, sometimes yes in the beginning, sometimes at the end, sometimes at the middle. There was not a structure to it. But you'll find in one of those channelings (it's interesting how much of this I remember), I asked the voice to be more concise. If you can imagine the arrogance. Well, I was.

PM You were just young and naïve.

Bruce It was a very arrogant thing to say. Then the voice answered. Then there was a channeling a year after that that said we'd been working with Jim to be more concise.

Larry Oh, well, it had an effect.

Bruce So I'd have to just paraphrase it by saying, John had a reverence to it that was beyond my understanding at that time, to answer your question.

Larry Do you have any doubt in your mind now as to the legitimacy of that channeling?

Bruce Whether everything is factually true in it? What do you mean by a legitimacy?

Larry That he was actually channeling spirits.

Bruce There's no doubt in my mind that he was doing that. There's no doubt that something was coming through. I don't think he was sitting down like you and I are, and just talking; information would come that Jim wouldn't know. So, there was no question.

Larry I'm curious, you know.

Tom Bruce, let me jump in here a second, for a factual thing. I've been transcribing, retranscribing a lot of these too. Here's one that says, "Dearly beloved, I have worked with many of you upon the inner plane several times in the past few weeks. I am Count de St. Germain." There's another one that starts out, "My name is Zoser," who is an Egyptian pharaoh, "and I work with you daily now." Here's another one that starts, "Greetings, my name is Kato." Here's one that starts out, "I am Jesus, the one who serves to aid humanity in the spiritual path." The voice would generally identify itself, and it's fun to throw that in there.

Bruce Thanks. Tom, your question number two, Would John apply these channelings? I wrote a memorandum on the history of the guiding purpose of the Institute; going back to the beginning, I cited the channelings because the very first statement of the Institute came from channeled material. To answer your question, Yes, some of these things literally were put into practice, things like the in-house lab, having

a laboratory at the Institute which was subsequently closed down because it would not have made a difference in the way that John was looking for transformation.

If you want to impact science, you have to do it in a credible setting with well-known people who are indisputably experts, who are also awakened and aware enough to be able to engage the issue. That's what we're trying to do in Fetzer-Franklin right now: impact the discourse of science by putting questions on the agenda that are very forward looking. But to answer your question about each and every thing being true in it: John certainly attempted to effectuate a lot of it. The thing that endures, I think, is the role of intent and the role of Spirit.

PM How long had John been doing channelings?

Bruce Camp Chesterfield was his first, right?

Larry Not necessarily. His very first took place in 1938. He said this; it was in Washington and it was—

PM That was a reading?

Larry A medium, and she predicted some—

Tom That was an astrologer who did the chart in '38. You're talking about besides that, Larry?

Larry John said that that's what got me interested in this.

Tom Yes, that was the astrologer that predicted the outcome of the 590 Case.

Larry That's right.

Tom Which was so unlikely, then it happened.

Larry That's the one.

Tom Bruce, this question is important to me, mainly for historical purposes regarding John, his own spiritual journey: How much validity did he put in Jim Gordon? And particularly Jim Gordon doing channelings, when Jim would claim both ways. He would claim that he wasn't giving himself up to the master coming through, but then he would also say he didn't remember what had been said.

I don't question those, but it implies some state in which the master was really speaking through, and it wasn't Jim's voice that was the giving the picture. But John put so much faith in that, he really gave that validity. He would probably had to have had a long history with channelings and mediums prior to that, and seeing

that some of them were valid. Can you put that into context? The question is, Why did John give so much validity to these, Bruce?

Bruce Well, because—

Tom Not that it was a bad idea. That's how John operated, but why do you think he gave so much credence to the Gordon channelings?

Bruce I think the reason is that the channelings, as a whole, talk about this global transformation. They talk about the evolution of humanity. John was a big thinker, a visionary. He, I think, felt that he was responding to the ultimate call and that he wanted his life work to make a difference. In some respects, at least initially, I think was a little vanity to John's approach. He wanted to be one of the key organizations that would leave its mark; but I think he was also way beyond that. The channelings go to the upliftment of humanity. That's a paraphrase out of one of the channelings. The upliftment of humanity is predicated upon awakening and, absent that, we're going to spiral down. We're not going to spiral up. We're not going to transform in a way that will succeed.

You're asking a general question. I'm giving a pretty general answer. Why did John give it validity? John felt that Jim was a peerless oracle. John felt that Spirit was asking him to do this, Spirit in terms of the highest sources. It's kind of like anyone in any faith. If they felt like whoever their savior or master was giving them a direct commandment, like an epiphany, that they felt compelled to do it. John just felt compelled. From that standpoint, he did have his filters, but I would say that the basic message was completely embraced by John.

I think that is an important statement to make, because that is part of the founding legacy: That individual and collective awakening to Spirit is the unique distinct purpose of the Institute, and whatever we do is a physical manifestation. We could choose a lot of different venues grounded in practicality, but ultimately it serves its purpose; you look at the channelings, and it all says that.

The reason why they wanted to heal people, and it literally says this in many channelings, is that balance of the physical, emotional, and mental is necessary in order to attain soul awareness. If you're in pain or if you're hungry or if you have some debilitating situation, you can't sit down and meditate. You can't become awakened. You're stuck. The reason why it's important to do all this in this plane is that, - you can go back to the channeling - this is the time where you can access all levels at once.

Tom Bruce, what I thought reading, the channelings, was that the devices were intended to actually correct the aura, which would clear some of the karma. Did you see it that way?

Bruce Yes, the channelings directly talk about this. I can find citations - again, this would take some study - but I can map the channelings into the early programs of the Institute, side by side. To answer your question, John had tried to apply as much of this as possible. The channeling, as I recall, was talking about how surgery and drugs were causing imbalances in karma, but that through a non-invasive diagnosis and treatment it would balance the physical, emotional, and mental, in order to enhance and enable soul awareness. That's what the whole purpose, to help people awaken, to help mankind uplift.

Larry Why did John choose Jim Gordon over John-Roger?

Bruce I don't think he ever trusted John-Roger. He was suspicious of John-Roger's motives.

Larry Right from the get-go? That's a good reason then.

Bruce A clear example of this is John Fetzer in the 80's, saying, "The only church I ever belonged to is Inner Light Ministries."

Tom Bruce, it seemed like Jim was the one person he wasn't suspicious of when Jim came on the scene. By '84, the channelings are actually directing John to set up Inner Light Ministries and make it separate from the Foundation and to fund it; there are funding instructions in a couple of the channelings. Why do you think that John, for Jim, didn't put up the same filter there that he would have for anybody else?

Bruce There's only one time that John had a negative reaction to that, and that was the channeling that happened in Tucson. I don't know if you know the reference and the date.

Tom I think I was reading it yesterday.

Bruce Okay, so it was what date?

Tom October 30, '84.

Bruce Exactly, that's—

Tom Several days of channelings.

Bruce I was there.

Tom Yes, you were there. You were asking these specific questions.

Bruce Yes, I was there. One of the statements that Jim made was to reserve 10 percent of his (John's) wealth for ILM; John had a powerfully negative response to that

afterwards. That's probably the only time I'd say where John felt Jim was getting in his pocket. But aside from that, I think that John accepted him as gospel.

Tom Why do you think so, Bruce? I keep coming back with the why, because John didn't do that with anybody else. Jim was a special case, and why do you think that is?

Bruce I went to a lot of other things with John, Silva Mind Control. I went to Georges and Judith Arsenault. There was another psychic that we went and saw. I've been with a lot of other psychics with John, and there was just never the quality of having a session like with Jim. The sessions with Jim in channeling are unlike talking to Jim on the phone. What I'm saying is, if you talk to Jim on the phone or in person, you have a conversation. If you go in a channeling, it's an experience. I think something fundamentally different was happening, and John recognized it. That's the way I would answer that: it was a precipitation of John's being, his purpose; and because it was consistent with what he felt was "the call," he didn't question it. That's why I think he accepted it as gospel.

Larry Except when there was money involved.

Bruce Yes.

Tom Yes, more or less. Even when there was money involved, he didn't have the same reaction he did with other people. Because he did give Jim money and he didn't throw him out. He didn't cut him off. He didn't end it. He may not have given him 10 percent, but maybe he did. Do you think John gave Jim 10 percent at the end, Bruce?

Bruce If you add it all up, ILM eventually got roughly 10 percent of John's net worth.

Tom There you go.

Bruce It came out very close to that if you add up all the different pots.

Tom There you go.

Bruce It's interesting how that was actually prophetic.

Larry Maybe he overcame that initial reaction.

Bruce No, he didn't.

Larry He didn't?

Bruce This is serendipitous. John didn't do any of these things consciously except for the ILM trust. That's the only thing he did as a conscious act. Everything else just kind of came in through the back door.

Tom Right, because you didn't know what values were going to be anyway?

Bruce Everything else happened through circumstance.

Tom Yes, no way to predict what the values would be on his date of death.

Bruce There were about four different pots involved, and it came out to around 10 percent.

Larry Do you want to continue with your questions, Tom, or I've got something on a different—

Tom I have one more, but Larry, we can take turns. I don't have a follow up to that, Bruce. I think that last answer you gave is a very important answer, that it was the quality of the experience. Is that what you would say?

Bruce Yes, it was the quality of the experience that confirmed it. There was nothing for him to doubt.

Larry Except for that one incident, that money was not raised.

Tom Oh, money was raised. Jim gives lots of specific suggestions on funding ideas. Before Inner Light Ministries, it was called IIL, the Institute of Inner Light at that time. Jim spends a lot of time on funding ideas.

Bruce Yes, absolutely. To answer your question, a biographer in the future can take some of the early channelings and lay it next to the minutes book for the Institute, and can see the correlations between what was channeled and what was funded. To answer your question, Was any of this tried? Did any of this try to get applied literally? Yes, a lot of it did. Was it practical? As a result of that, it had to give way to a new direction. To answer your question, Would future generations be well served to rely on the channelings in a literal interpretation? I would say absolutely not, aside from the philosophy of it. The specifics of what to do have to be grounded in what's practical to do at that point in time.

Tom Its major importance is that it's a powerful part of John's story, in my view.

Bruce It is, because John didn't see Spirit separate from the physical. He felt that he was literally trying to bridge those and to completely integrate both. I think that's the main story there.

Tom Well put.

Bruce It's not like it's Sunday morning, so I'm going to church. For him his reality is that he is an instrument of Spirit, so how does that impact how he thinks, talks, and acts? Anyway, let's move on.

Tom My other important question, Bruce, is number nine on the list. In your first interview you said, "John recruited people into tying their personal life purpose, almost in a religious sense 'salvation,' to being at the Institute. There was a purpose in being at the Institute that was critically important to the survival of the world." My question is around trying to implement that idea. Do you think John succeeded in implementing that? Talk about John's struggles with implementing that. How does that apply for today?

Bruce A lot of answers to that question.

Tom It's a big question.

Bruce The reason why there are a lot of parts to that question is, I would have a different answer than someone else in that period, and it would be very different than someone else that's just coming in new. All the answers are important, because they go to the fundamental purpose of the legacy. What is the legacy? It's a dynamic of a spiritual existence that informs, guides and directs. Then how do you actually effectuate that? You have to have people who are there for more than just to do a job. If it's the best pay they can get and with great benefits, then they could be mixing cement. But there's meaning behind the work, and the meaning is derived from it.

Is it because friends think it's cool to work there, or family or whatever? That meaning, if it's derived from the highest aspiration, and if I am constantly trying to renew myself and go to the next level, then it's not stagnant either. What gives the Institute founding vision, life, is the alignment of your avocation with your vocation.

Larry You're talking about a passion for what you're doing.

Bruce I'm talking about a passion, but it goes way beyond. For instance, social activists are very passionate and they feel that they need to heal injustices in the world. And, in a gross sense, suicide bombers are very passionate, but they're not driven by an authentic connection to The Light. They're driven by some type of misinformed fear. What I'm talking about is that the passion that comes from the highest aspiration, that comes from the purest form that's true.

The problem here is that my truth is limited to my ability to perceive it; I might be at a different level and progression than somebody else, and that doesn't make me either right or wrong. That's where the trick is in all of this: specifically, it's not a

religion but it is a spiritual practice. And you have all of the issues that operating in the world presents.

Larry Pragmatic issues.

Bruce Pragmatic issues. You have employment law. You have all of the seduction that comes with having money. Anyone that sits around in a foundation is going to be approached by people for not the highest purpose. What happens is that egos play tricks, and there are all kinds of seductions, and what a seductive draw the money becomes. The seduction of power, all of the things that people bring as kind of the shadow.

Larry And then politics enter.

Bruce That's why I'm giving you a lot of answers to this. My initial reaction was to answer about my experience, and that's the wrong answer, because it's not the one that's the enduring one that applies. It's interesting also; at the last Board meeting Mike Gergely structured a process where I think it was five or six of us told this story about interacting with John. I actually spent a couple of days meditating, reflecting on the whole story and what it meant to me, and what my path was. It was pretty cathartic, because I was able to go through all of the intense experiences I had with John and capsulize it through the lessons into a five-minute talk. I thought about just throwing it out afterwards, but I think I probably will have that transcribed and put in the records somewhere.

Tom Yes, that was my suggestion.

Bruce Flipping the tape.

Bruce We were just flipping the tape. Part of the answer is, this story that I have in my hand, and the problem here is, I'm not going to take five minutes and read this. I mean, look at the channelings: If you accept that John accepted those, then you also have to accept that it was important for John to have people there that believed in the purpose. They weren't there just for a job.

As a result of that, in the early days we actually had a Foundation Statement of Belief. When we interviewed people, we not only asked them to read that and talk about how they felt about it, but we asked them to take it home and talk to their spouse about it. We didn't want a situation where there was dissension in the house about some of the thoughts that were being discussed at the Institute. Then we had a fairly extensive interview process at that level, as well as reference checking and all the regular stuff. Then John would meet with people and screen them intuitively. That's how that went.

The way it works at the Institute now is more of a corporate approach. Here's the job description; let's talk about your work experience, and not so much about

your spiritual practice, if at all. Then some of this creeps in after the fact, but it's not a precondition to joining the organization.

Tom What do you think are the pluses and minuses either way, Bruce? Did John talk to you about the positives and the negatives of trying to do this approach?

Bruce As to the pluses and minuses, let's go back into the history. The plusses are that, if the organization was created to divine and respond to Spirit's guidance, then you need a core, certainly at the executive level, on board that affirms that and then practices. And we do have that. We have formation practices. We have generative processes. We have meditations. We have all kinds of rituals.

In the early days I think it was carried on in too fundamental a way, and the mistake I think that was made in the early 80's was a specific endorsement of one path. For instance, there was a policy of giving anybody time off and travel reimbursement to go to any Insight Training they wanted to. Why was it restricted to Insight Training? What if somebody wanted to go and spend time at a monastery? Well, that wasn't approved. What I'm saying is that, de facto, it had a cult atmosphere to it, because it gave a preference to one path over another. I think what that did was create some divisions between the 'true believers' and anyone else, which is counterproductive to what you're really trying to do.

Larry Do you think the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction?

Bruce That's for future Boards to say. I think it's always intentioned to accomplish in the world; at the same time you're held accountable to being. You're not really evaluated based upon your spiritual development; how do you balance that versus the crush of all of the outside pressure?

Tom I want to amplify that one, Bruce, because the notion then would be, if you're a 'true believer' that means you're 'bomb proof', you can't be fired, right?

Bruce Yes.

Tom If you're a 'true believer,' you can't be judged on anything else.

Bruce We had more than our full share of airheads who ended up finding their way out. That's the reality of it: it's a balancing act. John was such a practical person. He wouldn't give somebody a job just because they believed.

Larry Do you think John would be happy with the fact that most of the leadership tends now to be of a Catholic persuasion?

Bruce I don't think he would be disturbed about any of that. The thing is, that it's specifically with Larry and Mike and Rob. That's three people out of collectively the 15 on the Board, both Boards, and it's very eclectic.

Larry It remains so.

Bruce Yes. That's the whole thing, that it's eclectic. I think there's a pretty healthy balance of the East and the West. I think that the purpose of this type of work, and especially the work with Judy Skutch and all of those oral histories, is documenting the broad range of John's interest and approaches. Anyone looking at the record as a whole will conclude that John was not trying to advance a religion, but was trying to promote a search.

Tom Do you think it's important, that eclectic nature, Bruce, is crucial and therefore important to try to maintain?

Bruce I think it's been actually affirmed. It was an assumption early on, but it's been affirmed more recently. Books have come out on this; there's a book called the Wisdom of Crowds. The basic theory is - and it's been mathematically proven - that if you have enough people with diverse backgrounds, you produce a better result than any one person. What's wise about that, Tom, is there have been many crucial instances in the history of the Institute where someone gets out of line, and except for the Board acting as a whole, the imbalance would not get corrected.

An example is in the early days, Lloyd Swierenga concentrated power. He restricted access to information even from John Fetzer, and the Board wasn't informed. The lack of accountability through a larger body created a very perverse result. That old saying, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely," has been true whenever it surfaced in the Institute. That's why it's so important: There are a lot of concepts that have been forwarded and lifted up by Rob, for instance, that are very wise, such as the value of community. Rob has cited John's writings about community of freedom and so forth, which are very powerful concepts.

What I would say, to answer your question, Larry, is: Would John be happy with the practice here as a whole? I think he would. He would be delighted with it. Would he be where he was back in the 80's? No, he would move on beyond in some fashion.

Larry I'm going to be the devil's advocate with this question, okay? For a historian coming in 20 years from now, or even today, looking at John's spiritual growth, you could form the idea that John believed in every aspect of the paranormal, of the esoteric search. What I'd like to know from you is, to your knowledge, was there anything that he rejected?

Bruce I have to be careful not to make anything up. I'm trying to remember specific conversations we had about that, because otherwise I would just be making something up.

Larry Okay well, I just wondered.

Bruce Is there anything he rejected? He rejected a lot of things.

Larry Of an esoteric nature.

Bruce Oh absolutely, absolutely. I think he was very leery of cults.

PM Cults in what sense?

Bruce Well—

Larry Somebody getting control of your mind.

Bruce I'm trying to think of the big cults at the time. Jim Jones was after John's time wasn't it?

Larry Yes, Maharishi, would that be—

Bruce John was a TM meditator, but he didn't fund Fairfax, University of Maharishi in Fairfax, Iowa. That actually was one of our first big applicants for money, and they were turned down flat, even though John felt the practice had validity. He was not going to fund the organization. He would oftentimes talk about fraudsters and hucksters. Yes, he wanted quality only, and he wanted verification.

Larry Well, of course, nobody would advocate that.

Bruce Yes.

Larry You'd have lost your mind if you deliberately believed in a fraud.

Bruce I know but, I remember going to a psychic session in someone's basement. It was one of the splinter churches in town here. He told me afterwards, he said, "That's really low level stuff." So he rejected it out of hand.

Larry Well, there's an example.

Bruce That's an example of a message that came through, it was supposed to be divine and all that stuff, and he said, No, not for me.

Larry I think this is important to get this down for the future historian too. He has not dismissed himself as being prey to all these—

Bruce Right, he also doubted—

Tom By the way, the Jim Jones thing was in 1978.

Larry Oh, the Kool-Aid and all of that?

Tom Yes, I just googled it. It was '78.

Bruce John was always very disappointed in the people like that. There was a group out in Arizona where this same guy, seemed like every six years or so, would get a group of people together, tell them the end of the world is coming. They'd all donate to his church and they'd go to some mountain top waiting for the spaceships, and then the guy would disappear.

Larry That's the Millerite thing.

Bruce He kept doing it, and so things like that. Here's another story: When John was at wit's end trying to find water for his Tucson ranch, he finally brought a dowser out.

Larry Right.

Bruce The dowser was working the land, and John doubted the dowser.

Larry But when he took a hold of it, he dowsed himself.

Bruce Exactly. John almost uniformly doubted himself and questioned, and that's why he was looking for validity outside of himself.

Larry Let me give you an example. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, spiritualism had some offshoots of manifestations. There would be some spiritualists who would emit ectoplasm. There would be others with a trumpet, that would rise up in the air and blow. Do you think he would have rejected that aspect?

Bruce Yes. But on the other hand, at Camp Chesterfield, one of the pictures in his genealogy was a spirit photograph, and he didn't tell me which one.

Tom There are three of them in there, Bruce. You can see them. I found them. John pointed out one in the interview to Kaye. You can see the three because they're sketches.

Bruce So he was stuck, and then he got his spirit photograph. But what I'm saying is, the way John would talk about it, the way he would describe it, he wouldn't say it's a bunch of hooey. He would say, that's low-level stuff.

Larry Low level.

Bruce Then he would just dismiss it.

Larry Table tippings - but, on the other hand, he did believe in telekinesis, didn't he?

Bruce He funded the para labs so—

Tom He saw it. The pendulum is telekinesis.

Bruce Right. Yes, he used the pendulum himself.

Tom Scientology was around in the 70's, the Moonies were around in the 70's, so there were cults around in the 70's. I don't think John had any interest in Scientology. In fact, maybe the opposite.

PM That started in the 50's.

Larry I don't think that this has ever been brought up, but do you think he had an interest in astrology? I know he went to astrologersclairvoyants.

PM Jeanne Dixon is an astrologist.

Larry Yes, but the actual belief that you can read the stars and tell the future? Tom, did he ever talk to you about that?

Tom He said to Kaye Collins that he went to the astrologer in '38 in Washington, D.C., who shockingly told him the 590 case would be decided in his favor within eight months. He had spent six, seven years losing, losing, losing; then it happened in nine months instead of eight, but it happened. He told Kaye that event got him more serious about parapsychology.

Larry That's true, but I think back in the 30's the use of the word astrologer was kind of a generic term.

Tom I don't think so.

Larry Whereas today, it's not synonymous with a clairvoyant or a medium.

Tom I disagree with you on that regard as well.

Larry Do you?

Tom It's sort of a two-part question: I think John, at least by the time he was in his 70's when he'd been around the block many, many times, would have known that whether you're using the tarot cards or whether you're using astrology, that the operator is a clairvoyant using some kind of external mechanism to give a psychic reading. That external mechanism could be a number of things, but that it's really not the stars themselves that are forcing you to do things. It's the reader that's using some kind of mechanism to deliver a psychic reading to you, or a Light

Reading to you, whatever that would be. Bruce, do you think that's an accurate portrayal?

Bruce Yes, the skill of the counselor is a factor. It's not a computer program.

Larry It's not the mechanism then.

Bruce No, because Cleora Daily did an astrology session with John, and she practiced astrology quite a bit, and even charged money for some people. She had a lot of clients. But he didn't really take much of what she said for granted, for to be authentic.

Tom Right, otherwise there would be no good astrologers and poor astrologers. It would be a computer program, like Bruce said, which it isn't, and John knew that. He was looking for the real stuff, is what Bruce is trying to say, and he used his discernment and his intuition to try to separate the real stuff, the good stuff from the not-so-good stuff. Is that how you'd say it, Bruce?

Bruce Absolutely. And he was continually looking, and that's why he read. He was an avid reader and was eclectic in his approach; I have a whole case full of books and we only talked about one.

Let's go on to some of your other questions, Tom. Question Three: How important were Jim Gordon's early AMPRA materials from the 60's? How influential were they on John? Mike Gergely has the best story about the insignia of Archangel Michael and the introduction to John, and then Jim shortly after that shared the AMPRA materials with John; that story is best told by Jim and Mike. What I would say is, John kept those AMPRA materials in a file because John pulled those out later on. I was in an interview with John, when the architects came over and were asking him about the design of the Fetzer Institute; one of the drawings that Jim made of AMPRA, the AMPRA campus, was a drawing that John shared with the architects on the layout of the campus. They didn't use that, but it was part of that talk; and that would have been in the spring of 1984.

Tom But indicates the importance of it then.

Bruce Yes, so John kept the file and he pulled it out years after. What I'm saying is, he pulled it out years after Jim would have given it to him. Point number four, ditto regarding his 83 channelings. How influential were these? I think we covered that.

Tom Yes.

Bruce Number five: When did Archangel Michael first come in as an important factor? Boy, impossible for me to answer that.

Tom I raised that rhetorically, Bruce, because we may have to go on record at some point, saying it looks like Jim Gordon brought in the Archangel Michael, because Judy had never really heard it in her discussions with John, and Jim Keating hadn't either.

Bruce Yes. Your question, just for the record, is: When did Archangel Michael first come in as an important factor? I can't answer that. I don't know.

Larry It's a Masonic factor, Tom.

Tom Just in a minor sense, because I've been googling around, and I would say, Not really.

Larry Really?

Tom Yes, I would say not really. It's a theosophical; he was a minor figure in theosophy, but I've never seen it in the Rosicrucian tradition either, which is real close to the Masonic.

Larry It's a figure in the White Brotherhood.

Tom Which is a theosophical thing.

Larry If he accepted the White Brotherhood before, he would have accepted—

Tom I mean in the real deep sense, that the Archangel Michael is directing my life and directing my mission? This being is the preeminent thing, I think, that came in with Jim from what I can see. Sorry, Bruce, this is your interview.

Bruce Yes, I don't know. Question seven: Did John use the Ouija board with me? No, never, but we engaged in a lot of psychic practices or PK practices.

Tom Such as what?

Bruce Dowsing, aura reading. here was a session with Jim Gordon on reading auras down on Tucson ranch.

Tom Was John able to do it? Was John able to see auras?

Bruce I remember that I could after Jim worked with me. I'm trying to remember. John could sense them. You know that.

Tom Right, just wanted your answer.

Bruce So yes, aura reading, palmistry. Silva Mind Control had a whole bunch of psychic phenomena in it: Diagnosis, remote viewing, divination, not just with Sister Liz

but also with Jose Silva himself over in Detroit. John and I were there when we went to Nachi who was an Indian master with Frank and Margaret.

Tom In Kalamazoo?

Bruce In Kalamazoo. What were some of the other things? Pendulum for sure. Pendulum and crystals. Dream oracle. A lot of that. That's probably not the whole list, but it's a good start.

Larry Didn't leave out too much.

PM No.

Larry Tea leaves?

PM What did you do with dream work?

Bruce We had a couple of workshops with Jim Gordon. The whole Monday night group had a workshop with him on remembering dreams and dream analysis. I think even one of these books from J-R is about dreams and dream interpretation in journaling, and that kind of thing.

Larry Not in a Freudian sense.

Bruce No, there's a whole book on that.

Tom What your higher self is telling you through your dreams.

Bruce Exactly. Question eight: Regarding the Monday night group taking Silva Mind Control workshop, was John there? Oh, absolutely. He was there with Sister Liz and I was there. The whole Monday night group was there, which at that time included Mike and Carolyn and Cleora and Chuck and Frank and Margaret, Sister Liz obviously. She was teaching it. But then we went over and saw Jose Silva himself, in a two-day workshop over in Dearborn. Frank, and Margaret and John and I went to that.

Tom I didn't know that one; how successful was John in being able to do the Silva stuff?

Bruce After that workshop, John felt that he could start parting clouds.

Larry That wasn't a joke?

Bruce No, that was not a joke at all.

Tom I saw him do it, Larry.

Larry You saw him do it?

Tom Yes, more than once. He was great at that. That was his little three-second proof if anybody doubted that; that was easier than the pendulum.

Bruce That came out of the Jose Silva work.

Tom Interesting.

Bruce There was the whole thing about “cancel, cancel,” which is what Mike Gergely keeps saying now, “cancel that thought.” You can’t afford the luxury of a negative thought. Anything that’s negative that’s said, you have to follow it with “cancel,” so that it doesn’t impact your energy field. That’s one of the concepts that came out of that work, and Mike to this day still says that. I don’t know if he remembers where that came from, but I do.

Tom It’s like Mike ‘not stepping on a crack’, it had become a superstition to him, but yes, absolutely that’s from Silva.

Bruce Yes, it’s Jose Silva. Jose Silva also borrowed one of the first terms from Erickson. Who started hypnosis? It was before Erickson wasn’t it? But the phrase is, “Every day and every way, I get better and better.”

Larry That was early 20<sup>th</sup> century wasn’t it?

Bruce That was—

Larry Ralph—

Bruce Emile Coue.

Larry Mesmer started hypnotism.

Bruce He’s the one that came up with that phrase.

Larry Did he?

Bruce It is a universal phrase of wellness and self being. “Every day in every way I get better and better.” That’s the key affirmation in Silva Mind Control.

Larry I thought it was Dale Carnegie.

Bruce No. It’s been used by so many people, so much and it was Emile Coue. John started using that. So it had an impact on his life for sure. I don’t know if you knew that, the cloud parting came out of the Silva workshop.

Tom I did not know that. That's a good one.

PM What year did you do the workshop in Detroit? Do you remember that?

Bruce Well, Margaret and Frank were still in the Monday night group, and that had to be after he sold the Tigers, but probably it was in the springtime. I remember the weather.

Tom So '83 probably, Bruce?

Bruce It had to be the spring of—

Larry No, he sold the Tigers in '83.

Bruce Fall of '83, yes. It had to be the spring of '84. I remember it was sunny driving over there in his Cadillac, and we stayed at the Marriott in Dearborn.

Tom Okay, Mike makes reference to that trip. I didn't know that it was to see Jose Silva. He didn't say that.

Bruce Mike didn't go.

Tom Then it was some other one, okay.

PM The Monday night group in 1984, was that still meeting at John's office then?

Bruce No, we would have been meeting at the skyscaper.

PM Oh, okay, you were in the skyscaper.

Bruce The Hinman skyscaper.

Larry You were at the bank building, too.

Bruce Here's what it was. When I came up in September '81, the Institute was a small table and a filing cabinet next to Carolyn's desk at the broadcast house; then it went to the ISB building which was a small room, probably was ten by ten, which was barely big enough for the desk that Chuck had.

Larry That's because he was on the Board of Directors at that bank, was that John?

Bruce John was on the Board of Old Kent.

Larry Oh.

Bruce Which then became Fifth-Third. John was on the Board of America National Bank. What's the history there? That's just a matter of record. It was America National Bank, and then he left and Bill Robins went on the Board in his place, when it was Old Kent; then no one was on when it became Fifth-Third. I don't know the relationship with ISB or why they got that office; then we went from ISB bank and I wasn't there then. I was at the broadcast house. Went from ISB bank to the Comerica building, which would have been the fall of 1982. Then we were at the Comerica building when Kaye actually came on board. Kaye came on board back at the broadcast house and then we were at Comerica until probably the beginning of '83 or mid '83. I'd have to correct this data. I don't remember.. Then when the Tigers sold, we started adding staff.

Larry You said you were in a skyscraper for a while?

Bruce Yes, the Hinman skyscraper on Burdick Street.

Larry Yes, I know where it is.

Bruce The skyscraper is residential, and then there's a two story office; we had half of the top floor.

Larry Oh.

Bruce What were we talking about that we got—

PM The Monday night group, Silva Mind Control. So the Monday night group was meeting.

Bruce Yes, that's right. Yes, and met at the skyscraper. Yes, this was all coming together then. The Monday night group met at the skyscraper, so that would date when we moved into the skyscraper, because we didn't have the Monday night group in the Comerica building.

PM Okay.

Bruce This is starting to come together now for the timeline. The Monday night group met in the broadcast house until we started meeting in the Hinman. That's right.

PM You had told me you had met—

Bruce Monday night group would meet in the broadcast house.

Larry In his office.

Bruce But we never met in the Comerica building.

PM Okay, so you just went from the office to the Hinman.

Bruce Right.

PM Okay and then you'd still go down and have dinner—

Larry Chicken Charlie's. Schwartz's.

Bruce Typically, yes. I remember the Monday night group taking Silva. In that Silva workshop was also the first time that Mike Gergely channeled. He might not remember this, but Jim Gordon was there too. Jim Gordon interpreted Mike's experience. I'm sorry, Mike didn't channel. This is going too long. My brain's getting fuzzy.

Larry Astral?

Bruce Mike went out and saw a starry sky, and then Jim interpreted that for Mike.

Larry He never mentioned anything like that.

Bruce A starry skies is one of the upper levels you go by.

Tom He started to talk about that and then he stopped. Mike was very hesitant. He started to talk about that, and then he stopped and then he gave a little synopsis of what he took away from that. You remember that?

Larry Yes.

PM Yes.

Bruce You know what would probably be useful, Tom? It would be to get a few of us together, and even Sister Liz there, and talk about some of these experiences.

Tom Absolutely.

Bruce Sister Liz has a memory like a steel trap. I think between her and I, we'd get just about all the facts.

Tom Yes.

Larry Priscilla had a long talk with her.

Tom Get your Monday night group people together, and that would loosen Mike up a little bit too. Bruce, do you remember anything particular that John experienced in either in the Nazareth weekend or in Detroit or with Jose Silva as far as Silva Mind Control, besides the cloud thing?

Bruce The cloud parting came out of it. Healing and diagnosis, he was always interested in that part of the exercise. John was dealing with a lot of health issues as you know at that point, because in April of '84 John had shingles. That's because on opening day he got very sick and couldn't go to opening day after he sold the Tigers.

I wonder when we went to the Jose Silva workshop in Detroit. Might have been the fall. It was either the fall or the spring. I know because the weather wasn't hot or cold. It was very nice.

Larry You know, for somebody that lived as long as he did, he had a lot of bouts of illness throughout his life.

Tom Carolyn called him a hypochondriac, Bruce.

Larry No. He had duodenal ulcers several times. They had to operate eventually, I understand.

Tom Yes, my dad had that, it's nasty.

Bruce Yes. When I get the transcript, I'll have to correct this. I'll have to really reflect and try to figure out a relevant date for the Silva thing in Detroit. As to a timeline of the Monday night group, I think if we got Sister Liz and I together we could probably knock this out.

PM She's starting to feel better, and in the next week or two I'm going to set up an appointment with her. She's starting to see a couple of people.

Bruce But I hope her mind is still sharp.

PM Oh, it is. It's unbelievable.

Bruce Well, I think we can nail this then.

PM I'll tell you, those nuns, they retain it all. Yes, she's doing great except for the fall, but she's doing wonderful. She adored John; we'll set it up soon.

Bruce Number ten, Question Ten: In my opinion, how would I translate John's belief into the present? and Why, in my opinion, is John's journey and what John believed relevant or important for today? I think that's a question to answer properly, that really takes reflection.

Larry Yes.

PM You've touched on areas of that today.

Bruce That is the question.

Tom You're the guy. You're the guy to ask it, Bruce; you've known him longer than anybody.

Bruce You've got to answer the question. But that has answers at several levels, Tom, and that's the thing. There's a personal, a collective, and a common humanity level; then it also has to be bridged to the current situation, because John was so relevant he wouldn't just be abstract.

PM Can I make a suggestion with this? Get the transcript, you'll have had enough time to let it kind of stew, and maybe you could write up something for us at the end of the transcript, to make that the final. It would be a nice way to tie it all in.

Bruce Okay.

Tom You could write it or speak it, Bruce, whatever's easier for you. It would also be easy enough to do another 30-minute wrap up.

Larry Yes, because I've got a couple questions, but probably not today.

Bruce We didn't go into any of these other books.

PM I know we didn't.

Bruce We talked about one book out of 30 books here, Tom.

Larry We need to do it again.

Bruce We don't need to transcribe all this.

Larry Okay, I'll turn it off now.